Using the ELSSA:
From Data Analysis to Improvement Efforts

A Title III Accountability Resource

Fall 2012

The information in this document was generated by the Title III Regional Leads. The data presented are from a fictitious school district, Oak Tree USD. The examples of issues and ideas to explore are based on common experiences collected from LEAs throughout California, and are not required actions. This resource was created to illustrate how the information generated from the ELSSA can be used to inform the school improvement planning process.
ELSSA: Table 4

4. AMAO 1: How are EL students at each level of the CELDT meeting their growth target?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Year CELDT Level</th>
<th>Number in Proficiency Level Prior Year</th>
<th>% in Proficiency Level Prior Year</th>
<th>Number Meeting Growth Target</th>
<th>% Meeting Growth Target</th>
<th>State Avg. Meeting Growth Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intermediate</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Adv./ Advanced:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not English Proficient</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Adv./ Advanced:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Proficient</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quotes from *Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*

“Guideline #1: Providing ELD instruction is better than not providing it”

Page 27, Saunders and Goldenberg

“If English learners continue to receive explicit ELD instruction once they reach middle levels of English proficiency and as they move in to early advanced and advanced levels, they can more rapidly attain native-like levels of oral proficiency and avoid the plateau many experience before becoming advanced speakers of English”

Page 54, Saunders and Goldenberg

“Available research suggests that one way to promote higher levels of English language development among English learners is to make sure it is a school and district-wide priority”

Page 59, Saunders and Goldenberg
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Common Issues That Emerge From Data Analysis and Discussion

- Some subgroups of ELs are not making the expected annual progress (e.g., Intermediate and above level ELs)
- Student performance remains flat with no growth towards targets.
- Monitoring of ELD progress does not occur throughout the school year.
  - The local data system is not used to report or monitor ELD progress.
- District policy for providing ELD instruction is not clear.
  - Lack of direction for grouping students and organizing instruction to address students at all proficiency levels.
- Not all ELs receive an organized program of ELD instruction.
  - The master schedule doesn’t provide sufficient courses.
  - Only ELs at levels 1-2 receive defined ELD instruction.
  - Inconsistent use of ELD materials.
- Teachers haven’t been provided ELD materials or training for ELD instruction.
- There are not enough teachers to provide ELD instruction.

Ideas To Explore

- Produce local data reports for teachers and administrators that provide information about current and previous ELD performance.
  - Identify students who have and have not made progress.
  - Implement methods to monitor ELD progress throughout the year.
  - Include data analysis for ELD progress in PLCs and collaboration time.
- Articulate district policy and expectations for providing ELD instruction.
  - Create district-wide EL task force to examine and clarify ELD curriculum and instruction schools and grade levels. Address all ELD proficiency levels. Incorporate any changes into the district Master Plan.
  - Provide options for organizing ELD instruction in various settings (e.g., team teaching, grouping by levels across grade levels or spans, etc…). Create sufficient course sections in the Master Schedule.
- Purchase and/or implement ELD curriculum.
  - Develop accountability structures to verify that ELD instruction occurs as planned. (e.g., observations, schedules)
- Provide professional development for ELD instruction.
  - Include ELD in coaching and collaboration (PLC) discussions.
  - Address how to teach ELD within ELA instruction when appropriate.
  - Develop understanding for use of ELA and ELD standards.
- Implement “test chats” with students to explain the purpose of the CELDT and the importance of performing as well they can.
- Ensure that teachers with ELD assignments have appropriate authorizations.
  - Provide a training program to those who need authorization.

Quotes from Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches

“ELD instruction can be configured in many ways. It generally takes place during a designated ELD time block. It may occur during the time allotted to ELA… Students may be grouped by proficiency levels within a grade level so that a teacher instructs 1 or 2 levels. It may take place in the regular classroom where teachers “team” to cover…”
Page 84-85, Snow and Katz

“Assess learning through standards-referenced assessments.”
Page 104, Snow and Katz

“English learners should be carefully grouped by language proficiency for ELD instruction.”
Page 56, Saunders and Goldenberg
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ELSSA: Oak Tree USD

ELSSA: Table 2b

2. Annual Progress in Attaining English-language Proficiency (Title III AMAO 2)
   b. What percent of ELs in a language instruction educational program for fewer than 5 years met the English Proficient level on CELDT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMAO 2: Percent of EL Students Attaining English Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Meeting Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was Target Met? (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELSSA: Table 5a

5.a. AMAO 2: How are EL students performing on CELDT based on the length of time they have been in language instruction educational programs in U.S. schools? [REQUIRED]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time in U.S. Schools</th>
<th>Number Percent</th>
<th>Early Advanced or Advanced English Proficient</th>
<th>Early Advanced or Advanced; Not English Proficient</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Early Intermediate</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Total (by Time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 or more years</td>
<td>n= 444</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>n= 111</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>n= 91</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years or less</td>
<td>n= 278</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (by ELD level)</td>
<td>n= 924</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>4249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quotes from Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches

“…newly arrived English learners require intensive and targeted ELD instruction, additional instruction in literacy and content knowledge, and social support.”

Page 156, Dutro and Kinsella

Notes: ________________________________

____________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________
Common Issues That Emerge From Data Analysis and Discussion

- Programs for ELs at the earlier proficiency levels are not articulated, organized, or consistently implemented throughout the district.
  - Assumption that ELD is provided “all day long” in regular classroom settings.
  - Newcomers do not receive targeted ELD services.
- Students are not grouped by proficiency levels for ELD instruction.
- ELs are not monitored for the amount of ELD progress they make over time.
- A local data system report has not been developed to monitor ELD progress over time (by years in school).
- Staff does not receive information about how long ELs have been in school.
- Misalignment of ELD program and instruction to ELD Standards.
- Lack of articulation between elementary, middle and high schools regarding ELD program and student progress.

Ideas To Explore

- Establish district-level committee to clarify policies regarding the ELD program and services.
  - Articulate expectations for providing ELD instruction to newcomers and other students who are new to learning English.
  - Define expected progress by time in school.
- Identify options for how schools can organize ELD instruction when there are small numbers of ELs at the earlier ELD levels.
- Produce local data reports that provide information about how long students have been in school.
  - Identify students who have or have not made the expected progress within 5 years, or beyond 5 years.
- Implement methods to monitor ELD progress throughout the year.
  - Use formative assessments and/or benchmark tests to monitor progress and regroup students as appropriate.
- Purchase and/or implement standards-based ELD curriculum targeted for students at the earlier proficiency levels.
- Establish articulation processes and procedures for seamless ELD programs and services across grade spans.
ELSSA: Oak Tree USD

ELSSA: Table 2c

2. Annual Progress in Attaining English-language Proficiency (Title III AMAO 2)
   c. What percent of ELs in a language instruction educational program for 5 years or more met the English Proficient level on CELDT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time in US Schools</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Early Advanced or Advanced English Proficient</th>
<th>Early Advanced or Advanced; Not English Proficient</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Early Intermediate</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Total (by Time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 or more years</td>
<td>n=444</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>n=111</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>n=91</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years or less</td>
<td>n=278</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td>2137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (by ELD level)</td>
<td>n=924</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td>4249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELSSA: Table 5a

5.a. AMAO 2: How are EL students performing on CELDT based on the length of time they have been in language instruction educational programs in U.S. schools? [REQUIRED]

---

**Quotes from Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches**

“ELs typically do not receive ELD instruction once they get to the middle proficiency levels and, even less so, as they move into early advanced and advanced levels. The lack of ELD instruction is perhaps one reason for the stagnation.”

Page 54, Saunders and Goldenberg

“ELs need enhanced, explicit vocabulary development. Although ELs certainly need instruction in many aspects of academic English, recent research on vocabulary development emphasized the need for more robust vocabulary knowledge among students.”

Page 277, Echevarria and Short
Oak Tree USD

Common Issues That Emerge From Data Analysis and Discussion

- Policies for serving long-term ELs are not articulated, organized, or consistently implemented throughout the district.
  - Assumption that ELD is provided “all day long” in mainstream settings.
  - Advanced level ELs and long-term ELs do not receive ELD services targeted to their linguistic needs.
- ELs are not monitored for the amount of ELD progress they make over time.
- A local data system report has not been developed to monitor ELD progress over time (by years in school).
- Staff doesn’t have reports noting how long ELs have been in school.
- There is no formal process to monitor ELD during the school year.
- Teachers in mainstream ELA settings are expected to provide ELD instruction to intermediate and above level ELs, but have not received training or support to do so.

Ideas To Explore

- Articulate district policies for serving long-term ELs.
  - Provide training to counselors to ensure master schedules and course placements address needs of ELs.
  - Create appropriate course sections.
- Produce local data reports that identify ELs, their ELD proficiency levels, and note how long they have been in school.
- Establish systems to articulate EL needs and aligned services across grade spans (e.g., elementary to middle school, middle to high school).
- Purchase and/or implement ELD curriculum targeted for the linguistic needs of long term ELs.
  - Incorporate academic language development into ELD and content area instruction.
- Provide training regarding placement, methods of instruction, and materials.
  - Implement coaching and collaboration focused on instructing ELs (ELD and content area teachers).
- Define and provide ELD instruction that to addresses the needs of different EL subgroups (e.g., ELD I, II and III for newer students, specialized ELD for long-term ELs).
- Implement “test chats” with students to explain the purpose of the CELDT and set English language goals for the year.

Quotes from Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches

“ELs require four to six years to achieve what would be considered “early advanced proficiency (level 4).”
Page 54, Saunders and Goldenberg

“Proficiency in English requires systematic and explicit instruction in a dedicated course of study.”
Page 163, Dutro and Kinsella; Saunders, Foorman, and Carlson 2006; Norris and Ortega, 2006

“Long-term ELs may indeed have a comfortable command of conversational English yet display persistent and significant gaps in knowledge of English. …few middle or high schools provide formal language instruction once students reach the upper-intermediate and advanced proficiency levels. Consequently, there is no set-aside course or dedicated time with in a course for ELs to receive specific support in developing a firm grasp of English critical to successful grade-appropriate academic interactions, reading comprehension, and writing tasks. Yet this is the stage of language development when ELs are ready to grapple with a deeper understanding of how English works and to learn to use increasingly complex language structures and sophisticated vocabulary. “
Page 166, Dutro and Kinsella
ELSSA: Oak Tree USD

ELSSA: Table 6a (ELA)

6. How are EL students at the Intermediate level on CELDT performing on the CST (ELA and mathematics) by grade level?

What percent of students are in each of the following performance levels: far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient and advanced?

a. ELA CST Performance of District EL Students at Intermediate level on CELDT

(as percent of Intermediate level EL population tested at each grade level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA CST Performance</th>
<th>Number Percent</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Total (by CST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far Below Basic</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>n=14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>n=57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>n=49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (by grade)</td>
<td>n=128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELSSA: Table 6b (Math)

6.b. Math CST Performance of District EL Students at Intermediate level on CELDT

(as percent of Intermediate level EL population tested at each grade level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math CST Performance</th>
<th>Number Percent</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8 Gen. Math</th>
<th>Grade 8 Algebra</th>
<th>Total (by CST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far Below Basic</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>n=17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>n=45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>n=53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>n=11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (by grade)</td>
<td>n=128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quotes from *Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*

“What we have learned is that the difficulties English learners experience in school are often caused by inappropriate modes of instruction that do not consider their linguistic and sociocultural needs.”

Garcia 2003, McField 2006, Nieto 1999

“In many mainstream classes, little or no accommodation is made for the specific language needs of English learners, which poses a significant barrier to success because they are expected to achieve high academic standards in English.”

Page 253, Echevarria and Short
Elsssa

Quotes from Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches

“English learners are a heterogeneous group (age of arrival, educational history, English proficiency). Instruction, if it is to be maximally effective, has to be differentiated to address their diverse learning needs.... English learners benefit from teaching that attends to their individual learning needs and ensures that they are instructed to the same high standards as their peers.”

Page 231 and 232, August and Shanahan

“...academic English must be continually developed and explicitly taught. ... To accelerate the language proficiency of English learners, teachers of all disciplines must make "visible" the otherwise "invisible" skills of content specific academic language.”

Page 154, Dutro and Kinsella

“Without informed and systematic instruction in how English works—vocabulary, word usage, grammatical features, and syntactical structures—older school-age learners, are not apt to develop a confident command of English for complex social and academic purposes.”

Page 163, Dutro and Kinsella

Oak Tree USD

Common Issues That Emerge From Data Analysis and Discussion

- Policies for serving intermediate-level ELs are not articulated or consistently implemented throughout the district.
  - ELs are placed in mainstream settings where ELD and/or academic English are not specifically taught.
  - ELs are assigned to lower level academic courses due to their language level.
  - Curricular components that would benefit ELs are not implemented.
  - There is a lack of administrative monitoring for implementation.
- It is unclear how teachers in mainstream ELA and Math settings are expected to scaffold instruction for intermediate level ELs.

- The language demands in the mathematics curriculum are not addressed.
- All language domains are not developed during instruction (L-S-R-W).

- Staff does not have information about ELs’ language proficiency levels.
- ELD levels are not indicated on reports or rosters.
- Information is not provided to staff regarding how long students have scored at intermediate level.
- ELs are not monitored for ELD and content area progress during the school year.

Ideas To Explore

- Produce local data reports that show ELs’ ELD proficiency levels and academic performance (e.g., CELDT and CST scores).
- Provide professional development to help teachers focus on EL language development needs (e.g., L-S-R-W) including coaching opportunities and collaboration time for data analysis.
- Purchase and provide training for ancillary materials that will help teachers to support ELs in instruction.
- Include language objectives in content area instruction.
- Articulate an implementation support structure (e.g., walkthroughs, observations) for administrators to monitor the implementation of ELD, student placement, instruction, and reclassification.

- Design and schedule courses that address long-term English learner needs.
  - Determine entry and exit criteria for placement in specialized settings or courses.
  - Provide instruction for academic language and opportunities for structured conversations.

- Develop a system-wide process to ensure student information is readily available when mobility is a factor.

- Implement methods to monitor ELD and content area progress throughout the year.
  - Use formative assessments and/or benchmark tests to monitor progress and regroup students as appropriate.
  - Include students in the evaluation of their English language development progress and goal setting.
ELSSA: Oak Tree USD

ELSSA: Table 7a (ELA)

7. How are EL students at the English Proficient level on the CELDT performing on the CST (ELA and mathematics) by grade level?

What percent of students are in each of the following performance levels: far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient and advanced?

a. ELA CST Performance of District EL Students at English Proficient level on CELDT
(as percent of English Proficient EL population tested at each grade level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA CST Performance</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Total (by CST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far Below Basic</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (by grade)</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELSSA: Table 7b (Math)

7.b. Math CST Performance of District EL Students at English Proficient level on CELDT
(as percent of English Proficient EL population tested at each grade level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math CST Performance</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8 Gen. Math</th>
<th>Grade 8 Algebra</th>
<th>Total (by CST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far Below Basic</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (by grade)</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quotes from Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches

“Proficiency in academic language is essential to achieving long-term success in school and beyond.”
Page 153, Dutro and Kinsella

“Reliance on lecture and oral discussion can hinder an EL’s comprehension of new information.”
Page 255, Echevarria and Short

“Thus, while students are acquiring English proficiency it is essential to give them access to domain knowledge through their first language or through course content in English that has been carefully scaffolded to ensure it is comprehensible.”
Page 231, Echevarria and Short
Common Issues That Emerge From Data Analysis and Discussion

- There is a lack of professional development opportunities for teachers in mainstream ELA settings regarding use of language and content objectives to enhance the academic language of ELs.
  - All language domains are not developed during instruction (L-S-R-W).
- Professional development is not provided to raise awareness of specific language or academic needs of students.
- ELs are not monitored for ELD progress during the school year or over time.
- ELD and/or CST scores levels are not provided on reports or rosters.
- ELs are not placed in rigorous, grade level courses due to their language status.
- Reclassification policies are not clearly articulated or consistently implemented.
  - Students who score at the CELDT “English Proficient” level are not identified or closely monitored to determine when they are ready to be reclassified.

Ideas To Explore

- Provide professional development for scaffolding instruction (e.g., SDAIE), academic language development, identifying language demands in content areas, and differentiating instruction.
- Articulate an implementation support structure, e.g., administrators monitor the implementation of student placement, instruction, and reclassification.
  - Implement walk-through protocols on a scheduled basis.
- Provide accurate and timely ELD and academic performance data to staff.
  - Formalize the process for using student performance data to inform instruction. Incorporate into PLCs and collaborative discussions.
- Communicate and fully implement the reclassification policy and procedures.
  - Assign site teams to conduct process on a schedule.
  - Provide EL test scores to sites on a regularly scheduled basis to identify candidates for reclassification, and those students who need attention.
- Organize opportunities for recognition of reclassified students to help motivate others to become reclassified.
- Implement “test chats” with students to explain the purpose of the CSTs and set academic goals for the year.
ELSSA: Oak Tree USD

8. How are Reclassified-Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) students performing on the CST (ELA and mathematics) by grade level?

a. ELA CST Performance of District RFEP Students
(as percent of RFEP students tested at each grade level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA CST Performance</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Total (by CST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far Below Basic</td>
<td>n= 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>% 0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>n= 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>% 0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>n= 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>% 0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>n= 6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>% 43%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>n= 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>% 57%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (by grade)</td>
<td>n= 14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>% 2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.b. Math CST Performance of District R-FEP Students
(as percent of RFEP students tested at each grade level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math CST Performance</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8 Gen. Math</th>
<th>Grade 8 Algebra</th>
<th>Total (by CST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far Below Basic</td>
<td>n= 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>% 0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>n= 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>% 0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>n= 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>% 0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>n= 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>% 14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>n= 12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>% 86%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (by grade)</td>
<td>n= 14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>% 2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quotes from *Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*

“…Teachers mistakenly viewed students’ academic limitations in English as a motivational issue rather than a linguistic or language-acquisition one.”

Page 254, Echevarria and Short

“*The relationship between literacy proficiency and academic achievement grows stronger as grade levels rise- regardless of individual student characteristics.*”

Page 255, Echevarria and Short

Notes: ____________________________
Oak Tree USD

Common Issues That Emerge From Data Analysis and Discussion

- RFEPs are not identified on district reports, for staff (e.g., teachers, administrators or counselors). RFEPs are not closely monitored for academic progress.
- No additional services are in place to support RFEP achievement (e.g., after school programs, tutoring).
- There is no organized professional development to help teachers modify curriculum or instructional strategies to address RFEP academic needs.
- Collaborative planning time and PLC discussions do not specifically address RFEP performance.
- Students are not consistently monitored for progress if they move between district schools or across grade spans.

Ideas To Explore

- Produce local data reports that indicate the RFEPs and show their academic performance (e.g., CST scores).
  - Regularly monitor RFEP academic progress throughout the school year.
  - Ensure that ELs are formally monitored for two years after reclassification.
- Provide professional development to help teachers use the curriculum and methods to boost RFEP academic performance.
  - Implement coaching processes.
- Use collaborative planning time to address RFEP needs.
- Implement tutoring programs or after school services to help boost student performance.
- Implement system wide processes to ensure student information is readily available when mobility is a factor.
- Include RFEPs in “test chats” to explain the purpose of the CSTs and set academic goals for the year.

Quotes from Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches

“When students are given time to develop academic English proficiency in their programs and are exited (and redesignated) with criteria that measure their ability to be successful in mainstream classes, they perform on average as well or better than the state average on achievement tests.”
Page 254, Echevarria and Short

“Teachers sometimes assume that students’ academic language is more developed than it is because of their facility with discourse in more informal situations where context helps mediate language.”
Page 217, August and Shanahan

“Academic achievement across the secondary school curricula will be accelerated only when students are truly proficient in English.”
Page 163, Dutro and Kinsella

Notes: __________________________________________
________________________________________________
________________________________________________
________________________________________________
________________________________________________
________________________________________________
“The more successful programs for English learners provide flexible pathways for students, through the program and into regular curriculum. The key is to make sure that the program articulates smoothly with the mainstream program to maximize its effectiveness and ease the students’ transition when they exit the language support programs and have a full schedule in the mainstream classes. Moreover, making explicit a clear timeline and set of courses that will lead to graduation may help reduce the dropout rate of older English learners.”

Page 288, Echevarria and Short
Common Issues That Emerge From Data Analysis and Discussion

- Some ELs and RFEPs are not able to pass or score proficient on the CAHSEE.
- Students are not provided adequate preparation.
  - Students are not placed in rigorous content courses.
  - Students are not assigned to appropriate intervention courses.
  - No CAHSEE preparation class is provided.
- Students are not advised of CAHSEE preparation opportunities.
- No additional services are in place to support RFEP achievement (e.g., after school programs, tutoring).
- ELs and RFEPs are not consistently monitored for progress if they move between district schools or across grade spans.

Ideas To Explore

- Identify ELs and RFEPs who would benefit from CAHSEE preparation instruction.
  - Teachers and counselors inform students and parents of opportunities.
  - Provide classes, tutoring, and/or after school services to support students.
- Use the local data system to produce regular reports to monitor performance and identify students who would benefit from CAHSEE preparation and support.
  - Implement “test chats” with ELs and RFEPs students to explain the importance of performing to the best of their ability on the CAHSEE.